

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-16 and 27-43 are presented in the present application. Claims 11-16 and 27-32 are amended, Claims 1-10 and 17-26 are cancelled without prejudice, and Claims 33-43 are added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to; Claims 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 1-32 were objected to; and Claims 1-31 were indicated as allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and the objections set forth in the Office Action.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. In view of this indication, the specification has been amended as suggested in the outstanding Office Action. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, it is noted that these claims were amended on September 4, 2003 to recite the metes and bounds of the claimed invention as suggested by the outstanding Office Action. In addition, it is noted that Claims 30-32 have been further amended to clarify the novel features. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the objection to Claims 1-10 and 17-26, that objection is considered moot because Claims 1-10 and 17-26 have been canceled. Regarding the objection to Claims 11-

16 and 27-32, it is noted that the claims have been amended as suggested to correct cosmetic matters of form. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested these objections be withdrawn.

New Claims 33-43 have been added to set forth the invention in a varying scope, and Applicants respectfully submit the new claims are supported by the originally filed specification. New independent Claim 33 is directed to a media source that recites similar features to allowable Claim 1. New Claim 34 is similar to allowable Claim 2. New Claim 35 is similar to allowable Claim 3. New Claim 36 is similar to allowable Claim 4. New independent Claim 37 is directed to a media sink that recites features similar to allowable Claim 5. New Claim 38 is similar to allowable Claim 8. New Claim 39 is similar to allowable Claim 9. New independent Claim 40 is a method claim that recites analogous features to allowable Claim 17. New Claim 41 is similar to allowable Claim 18. New Claim 42 is similar to allowable Claim 19. New Claim 43 is similar to allowable Claim 20. Thus, no new matter has been added and these new claims are believed to be allowable for the reasons for which Claims 1-5, 8-9, and 17-20 were allowable.

Application Serial No.: 10/656,764  
Reply to Office Action dated May 9, 2007

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Registration No. 40,073  
Attorney of Record

Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 59,140

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel. (703) 413-3000  
Fax. (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 10/01)

BDL:RFF:brf

I:\atty\BRE\28s\282721US\Amendment due 09-09-07.doc